



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/599,298	06/21/2000	Scott L. Ruthfield	MS1-560US	6997

22801 7590 09/29/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC  
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500  
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

SAX, STEVEN PAUL

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 09/29/2003

7

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.  
09/599,298

Applicant(s)  
Ruthfield et al

Examiner  
Steve Sax

Art Unit  
2174



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-87 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some\* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 6 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2174

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This application has been examined.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

3. Claims 1-22, 24-32, 34-38, 40-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Fernandes (6014135).
4. Regarding claim 1, Fernandes shows the single application program configured to provide the single navigable window (Figure 3, 5), multiple different functionalities to which single navigable window can be navigated by a user (column 8 lines 29-40), a navigation model that is configured to manage the user's navigation activities within the single navigation program (column 10 lines 1-29).

Art Unit: 2174

5. Regarding claim 2, the navigation model includes a navigation stack (inherent in column 10 lines 1-6, and also see column 10 lines 25-45).

6. Regarding claim 3, the navigation stack includes back and truncate stack (see Figure 5, the view/appearance and search elements).

7. Regarding claim 4, the program is configured to provide navigation instrumentalities associated with the single navigable window for use to navigate the window inside individual functionalities and to the different functionalities (Figures 5-7, column 11 lines 30-50, column 13 lines 55-68).

8. Regarding claim 5, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes links associated with the different functionalities to which the single navigable window can be navigated (column 10 lines 55-67, column 13 lines 1-25 for example).

9. Regarding claim 6, one of the navigation instrumentalities includes browser like navigation buttons that can be used in conjunction with the model to navigate the window inside and between functionalities (Figure 3 the top left corner for example, note the arrow buttons).

Art Unit: 2174

10. Claim 7 shows the same features as above and is rejected for the same reasons.

11. Regarding claim 8, a context sensitive command area is provided in which command sets are changed as different functionalities are navigated (see Figure 7 and note column 13 lines 55-67 and column 14 lines 1-14).

12. Regarding claim 9, the different functionalities include document centric functionalities (column 10 lines 37-44).

13. Regarding claims 10-11, the functionalities include: web browser (column 10 lines 20-35, column 12 lines 10-23), email functionality (column 10 lines 50-57), planner (column 11 lines 50-67), contacts (column 11 lines 8-20), word processing (column 10 lines 58-65).

14. Regarding claim 12, as demonstrated above, the functionalities enable the user to accomplish different tasks.

15. Regarding claim 13, as demonstrated above, each different task relates to a different document type (again column 10 lines 56-67).

Art Unit: 2174

16. Claims 14-19 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.

17. Regarding claim 20, the email and Internet are examples of extensible functionality (column 10 lines 10-17 and 55-65).

18. Regarding claims 21-22, the program is configured to receive a module embodying functionalities via the Internet, which is a network (column 10 lines 10-17).

19. Claims 24-32, 34-38, 40-47 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.

20. Regarding claim 48, if a user's activities impacts the model, an entry is manipulated (column 11 lines 1-26).

21. Regarding claim 49, an entry is removed (column 10 lines 44-48).

22. Regarding claim 50, the entry removed is one away from the present activity, that is, the last navigated entry (column 10 lines 44-48).

Art Unit: 2174

23. Regarding claim 51, an entry is added (column 11 lines 1-26).
24. Regarding claim 52, the navigation entries are reorganized responsive to a non-navigation action (column 11 lines 53-65).
25. Regarding claim 53, the state of the document is maintained in response to user navigation activities that take the user on a navigation path outside the direct path to the document (column 11 lines 45-65, column 12 lines 1-25).
26. Regarding claim 54, a URL is modified (column 13 lines 63-67).
27. Regarding claim 55, a title is modified (column 14 lines 1-26).
28. Regarding claim 56, an entry is modified so that it points to a location different from a previous location (column 11 lines 35-64).
29. Claims 57-87 show the same features as above and are rejected for the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2174

30. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. Claims 23, 33 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fernandes (6014135) and Starr (6606606).

32. Regarding claims 23, 33, and 39, in addition to the aforementioned, Fernandes does not go into the details of the functionalities being fee based in connection with a subscriber model, but does mention reorganization of entries responsive to a non-navigation action (see paragraph 24 of this Office Action). In addition, Starr shows fee based functionalities in accordance with a subscriber model (Figure 6, column 4 lines 15-5). The use of this reorganizes entries in response to a non-navigation action. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skill in the art to have this functionality type in Fernandes, because it would be a convenient way to have reorganized entries in a navigation model in response to a non-navigation action.

33. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Steve Sax at telephone number (703) 305-9582.



Art Unit: 2174

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steve Sax whose telephone number is (703) 305-9582. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid, may be reached at (703) 308-0640.

The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703) 872-9306

Official Communication

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.



STEVEN SAX  
PRIMARY EXAMINER